

Capitol Avenue/East High Street Rezoning and Overlay District Plan
Planning Division Staff analysis of comments received to date
May 27, 2016

Public Meetings:

Neighborhood meetings were held on April 21, April 26, and April 28 at City Hall. The same presentation was given at each meeting. About 50 people attended over the course of the three meetings.

Staff presented the proposal to the Historic Preservation Commission on May 10.

Summary of Verbal Comments Given at Meetings:

Several participants were concerned about the build to line concept for High Street, that many historic structures along this street would be essentially designated for future demolition in order to support the street front development plan. An idea that was voiced was to reduce the scale of the street front build to line requirement to the areas around the existing street front developed areas.

The design standards need to be a bit stronger, especially for Capitol Avenue. Brick or stone should be required on the side facades as well as the front. A maximum amount of glazing should be required as well as a minimum.

The zoning proposed for the 700 block of Capitol Avenue is inconsistent with the proposed zoning for the rest of the residential structures along the street. The proposed zoning should be consistent along Capitol Avenue.

There should be a process for restoring historic features of a building that happen to conflict with the new regulations.

Summary of Written Comments: (comments received from 7 people to date)

- Turn of the Century Architecture in the downtown is one of Jefferson City's greatest assets.
- The Build line along High Street may have undesirable consequences
- Overlay building features should be based on styles of architecture from the time period and require most common features for whatever particular style a builder chooses.
- Regulations on roof style are unnecessary.
- Setback on High Street needs to be reconsidered, the proposal would encourage demolition of historic homes.
- Storefront additions to existing homes should be required to be removed.
- The regulations should encourage preservation rather than demolition.
- On the whole, the proposal seems reasonable.
- A size limit should be placed on commercial buildings in order to prevent the large buildings that would be incompatible with the area and to discourage property owners from holding on to property for future combination with other parcels to support a larger building.

- There should be more clarification on what activities require a building permit and what the process for processing a building permit within an overlay district entails.
- Landscaping requirements should be stronger, with landscaping around porches.
- Specific recommendations regarding prohibited materials (such as prohibiting fake brick or metal roofs) and recommendations on construction of porches.
- Recommendation that signage be limited to 8 feet in height in the High Street District.
- Specific recommendations on specific architectural features to include in both proposed overlay districts.
- Concerns that uncertainty created by regulations in historic areas can affect the decision process of investors.
- That the regulations should be support the restoration of homes to their original look and character.
- That the build-to line requirements should be more representative of the existing construction along blocks, and the build-to-street line for the entirety of the East High Street district should be removed.
- That the overlay district and zoning plan for the area should align with the Capitol Avenue Historic District.

Staff Response to Comments:

High Street Build Line – Many comments were received relating to the proposed street front build line requirement for new buildings within the High Street overlay district. Many of these comments focus on the sections of High Street (and the other streets) that remain developed with historic residential style buildings, and that forcing new buildings to the street line in these areas would be detrimental to the prevailing building type along the street. Several recommendations and ideas on how to encourage the storefront commercial type of development while preserving the historic homes were given. Staff plan to research the matter and map out the existing storefront and residential style buildings with the goal of identifying commercial nodes that exist and crafting regulations that would support those nodes and “work outward” from them.

Capitol Avenue – several comments requesting a higher level of building design regulation for Capitol Avenue were received. Staff concur that a higher level of design currently exists along Capitol Avenue compared to the rest of the study area and increased design regulations for the properties fronting Capitol Avenue are likely supportable by the property owners and the community. Staff believe that if there is to be a higher level of design requirements for the properties along Capitol Avenue, these requirements should be separate from the requirements for other streets within the study area.

Specific Building Materials – The original proposal was crafted by City staff in a manner that attempted to avoid specific references to materials, type of windows, roofing materials, etc., in an effort to keep the regulations relatively simple and flexible. Several comments requesting references to specific materials were received, and staff concur that certain areas of the proposed overlay district regulations could be reasonably strengthened with references to specific material types or design.

Building Size Limit – Staff concur with public comments that building scale is an important design element, and the size of a building (when out of character with the surrounding buildings) can have an overly negative effect along a street frontage. This would be particularly applicable in areas with buildings that are predominantly residential in style and scale. Within the Capitol Avenue study area, there are several buildings that are out of scale with the predominant residential designs, but it's important to realize that the land use plan for the area includes multifamily residential uses. Staff believe that more specific regulations relating to large buildings may be necessary in order to address the concerns regarding scale while still permitting multi-family buildings of an appropriate design.

Signage – Signage allowances within the districts should closely resemble existing signage regulations that are contained within Chapter 3 of the City Code (Advertising and Signage). Signage regulations by their nature are complex, and a separate set of signage regulations for a small area of the city would be difficult to administer by City Staff and would be confusing to sign installers (especially if the regulations are contained in a separate chapter of the City Code – Chapter 3 vs. Chapter 35).

Landscaping – While many properties along Capitol Avenue have a well landscaped front yard, including plantings around the porches as recommended in the comments, staff do not feel that the landscaping situation along the street or within the districts as a whole is strong enough to support the incorporation of landscaping requirements into the overlay district regulations. Also, the administration of landscaping regulations would be difficult for a variety of reasons, including limited staff resources, the lack of a permit process for installation of landscaping, and the temporary nature of plantings.

Proposed Zoning for Capitol Avenue – Staff attempted to respond to preliminary comments regarding the permitted uses for Capitol Avenue during the initial development of the implementation plan. These comments revolved around the desire to permit retail uses, (such as small scale retail uses or where there is existing commercial zoning). Staff's response to these comments was twofold, to incorporate limited commercial and personal service uses into the MU-1 zoning district that is proposed for Capitol Avenue, and to propose a higher level of zoning (in the form of the MU-2 district) for the 700 block of Capitol Avenue (using the existing C-1 zoning in place for that block as justification for a higher level of zoning for the block). In retrospect analysis, it seems that the comments (to permit limited retail uses along Capitol Avenue and allow retail uses specifically in the 700 block) were both addressed by incorporating limited retail uses into the MU-1 district and that it was not necessary to propose a different type of zoning for the 700 block in order to address essentially the same comment. Proposing a different level of zoning for a single block of the residential style buildings along Capitol Avenue would be an inconstant zoning situation, as the character of the street is essentially the same along its length (with the commercial style buildings at the northwest corner of Capitol and Lafayette being a notable exception). There's nothing particularly unique about the 700 block that differentiates it from the rest of the corridor. If there is a desire to permit a wider set of commercial uses in the residential style buildings along Capitol Avenue (such as restaurants) that decision should be applicable to the entirety of Capitol Avenue, not just one block of it. Staff do not recommend restaurants as a permitted use, as the parking associated with such uses, the modifications necessary to buildings to accommodate a restaurant, and the increased traffic and noise would be inconsistent with the current character of the street. Staff recommend consideration of placing the 700 block of Capitol Avenue in the MU-1 district, consistent with the proposed zoning of the rest of the residential style buildings along the street.

Structure of Regulations – Planning Division Staff have a particular interest in ensuring that the manner in which the overlay district regulations are written and codified (inserted into the City Code) is such that they are simple to explain to the development/real estate community and the general public, and that they can be fit within the existing building permit and development review processes of the City. Planning Division Staff would also prefer that the overlay districts be structured so that they could be adopted (without modification) in other areas of the City, with the goal being to have “standard” overlay regulations for similar historic areas of the City.

Timeline – the timeline for presentation of the proposal to the Planning and Zoning Commission should be modified, in order to provide additional time for staff to modify the proposal in response to the public comments and allow the public time to review the modified proposal and make additional comments.

Conclusion:

Public comments regarding the proposal were generally positive, with certain concerns regarding the specifics (especially the build line along High Street). Planning Division staff will conduct additional research in the areas where comments were submitted and modify the proposal appropriately. The timeline for presentation of the proposal to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council will be updated in order to allow sufficient time for modification of the proposals by staff and review of the modified proposal by the public.

Updated timeline:

June 9 – Informational Presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission

June 14 – Informational Presentation to the Historic Preservation Commission

July 14 – Formal Presentation and Public Hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission

August 15 – Public Hearing and Adoption of Proposal by the City Council

COMMENT FORM

CITY OF JEFFERSON
Planning Division
320 E. McCarty Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
573-634-6410
icplanning@jeffcitymo.org

Capitol Avenue and East High Street
Rezoning and Overlay Districts
Neighborhood Informational Meeting

April 21 ~ April 26 ~ April 28, 2016
5:30 PM
City Council Chambers

Please write comments or questions below:

Roof - new restrictions are a ridiculous concern, Flat roofs look fine and the added cost to property owners will be severe, Very unnecessary!

Set backs on High St need to be reconsidered, The proposed change would encourage demolition of ~~many~~ historic homes. Just the opposite needs to happen: Remove additions that have been brought to the street front.

Name (optional): Lois Hogan

Comments and questions may also be directed by mail or email to the above address.

Individuals should contact the ADA Coordinator at (573) 634-6570 to request accommodations or alternative formats as required under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
Please allow three business days to process the request.

COMMENT FORM

CITY OF JEFFERSON
Planning Division
320 E. McCarty Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
573-634-6410
icplanning@jeffcitymo.org

Capitol Avenue and East High Street
Rezoning and Overlay Districts
Neighborhood Informational Meeting

April 21 ~ April 26 ~ April 28, 2016
5:30 PM
City Council Chambers

Please write comments or questions below:

Please don't tear buildings
down Preservation Pays off
better in the end!

Name (optional): _____

Comments and questions may also be directed by mail or email to the above address.

Individuals should contact the ADA Coordinator at (573) 634-6570 to request accommodations or alternative formats as required under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
Please allow three business days to process the request.

COMMENT FORM

CITY OF JEFFERSON
Planning Division
320 E. McCarty Street
Jefferson City, MO 65101
573-634-6410
jcplanning@jeffcitymo.org

Capitol Avenue and East High Street
Rezoning and Overlay Districts
Neighborhood Informational Meeting

April 21 ~ April 26 ~ April 28, 2016
5:30 PM
City Council Chambers

Please write comments or questions below:

On the whole, this seems like a very
reasonable, well-considered proposal.

Name (optional): _____

Comments and questions may also be directed by mail or email to the above address.

Individuals should contact the ADA Coordinator at (573) 634-6570 to request accommodations or alternative formats as required under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
Please allow three business days to process the request.

Barron, Eric

From: Stratman, Anne
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2016 7:59 AM
To: McMillan, Janice; Barron, Eric
Subject: FW: Comments for High & Capitol zoning

From: Matt Holland [<mailto:matt.holland@handhpropertymanagement.com>]
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2016 2:00 AM
To: Stratman, Anne
Subject: Comments for High & Capitol zoning

To whom it may concern,

I am excited about the ongoing revitalization effort in the Downtown area but I have a few concerns about some of the proposed zoning and overlay changes. It is my belief that the wide range of ornate turn of the century architecture in the Downtown area is one of Jefferson City's greatest assets and could be used to promote tourism as well as being a source of city pride. I feel that some of the proposed changes will work to diminish this area by encouraging the replacement of some of the buildings with structures not in character with the area.

In regards to setting a build to line for the High Street zoning area I feel that some of the proposed setbacks will force new construction closer to the road than neighboring buildings removing all green space on the front of those lots and possibly encouraging neighboring buildings to be torn down because they no longer fit the profile of the area. I understand the need to increase population density in the area to realize the total plan and that some buildings may need to come down to accomplish this but I feel that setting a build line at 10 feet on a block where most of the existing buildings are build at 20+ feet with small front yards will upset the aesthetic of the area. I believe that a variation on the average build line idea proposed for side streets may be a good compromise. Perhaps when the average is under a given amount, say 15 feet, the build line could be set at 10 feet otherwise it would be set at the average or even the average +/- several feet if the block is already fairly sporadic but aesthetically pleasing. I would also like to state that I am a proponent of residential property having some type of front yard.

I also believe that, in regards to the overlays, required building features should be based on styles from the time period and require most if not all common features for whatever particular style a builder chooses. I also believe a minimum brick/rock standard should be set as well as a maximum glass amount. I fear that there are many modern styles that could meet the proposed criteria yet would not work to preserve the character of the neighborhood.

Thank you for taking the time to seek community input.

Sincerely,
Matt Holland
H&H Property Management.
(573)645-8850

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Comments on Capitol Avenue and E. High Street Re-Zoning and Overlay Districts
In response to Public Meeting held on April 26, 2016

The Historic City of Jefferson (HCJ) applauds the City of Jefferson's Planning and Zoning Division for tackling a difficult task in revitalizing the East Side of Jefferson City. This section of Old Town has seen deterioration ever since the Missouri State Penitentiary Riot of 1954. Part of what makes this task difficult is approaching the issue through rezoning and building permit requirements, rather than Design Guidelines, as have been developed for the downtown area.

The proposed Overlay Districts (OD) seem to apply primarily to new construction, with issues related to existing buildings not addressed. While additions to existing buildings would have to conform with the OD requirements, many detrimental changes to existing buildings would be allowed under "maintenance" or similar activities that do not currently require a building permit. Design guidelines would encompass all exterior construction activities, even those involving exterior "maintenance." The proposed ODs do not provide examples of desired outcomes as would Design Guidelines. So while the ODs are a step in the right direction, HCJ encourages the City of Jefferson to follow this effort with development of Design Guidelines to address existing buildings and to give more detailed guidance for both new construction and rehabilitation, to allow and encourage new buildings to blend more appropriately with their historic surroundings and old buildings to retain their historic character.

Another concern when drafting new rules or restrictions is unintended consequences. Changes to this neighborhood from the 1960s to the 1990s are explained in the 1996 "Comprehensive Plan Update" for the City of Jefferson. This document describes development trends that have impacted Capitol Avenue, E. High Street and the surrounding neighborhood for decades:

The land use plans prepared in 1969, 1978 and 1986 have perpetuated the idea of converting much of this neighborhood to more intensive land uses. The current zoning code permits more intensive use of many properties than what currently exists. The 1969 Comprehensive Plan proposed an extension of the downtown commercial area along High Street to Lafayette Street. Also, commercial nodes are proposed for groups of lots farther east. The 1978 Land Use Plan proposed a similar arrangement of land uses for this neighborhood. The 1986 Land Use Plan was the most aggressive in terms of the amount of commercial development proposed for this area. Also, the 1986 plan was specific in designating much of the area for medium to high density residential (7 to 29 dwelling units per acre) ... This planning technique is.... easy to implement, if a community is dealing with undeveloped territory. However, it can have unintended consequences if applied to existing developed areas. Often what happens is that reuse or redevelopment to higher density uses occurs on

a piecemeal basis, creating land use conflicts between the new land uses and adjacent ones.¹

While dated, the comments made in the 1996 plan still hold true for this neighborhood. When this neighborhood was zoned commercial, the State of Missouri's Jefferson Building was fairly new, so the city anticipated more commercial buildings in this neighborhood. In the four decades since, we have seen that developers prefer to build commercial / office buildings on open space at the edges of previously developed areas. This allows for buildings with larger footprints and parking areas, where average daily traffic (and therefore visibility) is higher than exists in the E. High Street corridor. This trend is unlikely to change, as assembling multiple lots, possibly demolishing buildings or dealing with the potential for hazardous materials, is more difficult and time consuming for developers than building on bare ground.

HCJ believes that the current proposed language will perpetuate the trend of people holding onto residential rental property, hoping someday to "hit the jackpot" when a developer wants to pay commercial value for the land under their rental property. This has not happened in the last four decades, and it is time to address the unintended consequences of past actions by encouraging redevelopment, not solely new development, in this neighborhood. So while we understand the desire for conformity and higher tax revenue along E. High Street by encouraging development of new retail / commercial buildings, we believe a better option would be eliminating the possibility of large office or retail buildings in this neighborhood. The existing intrusion of the Missouri Chamber of Commerce building should not be repeated in this neighborhood, and limiting the size of commercial or retail buildings to those currently in existence would remove this threat. This change would also discourage property owners from continuing to rent residential property in a way that maximizes income (single family homes converted to multiple units) and waiting for the big payoff, and encourage them to sell now for a reasonable price based on the value of the existing structure, rather than an inflated sense of the commercial value of their land.

The ODs do not seem to represent significant positive change in the zoning for this area. The existing C-1, C-2 and C-3 zoning would change to MU-1 and MU-2, with the changes noted being no restaurants or drive-thru services allowed in MU-1, and these plus no new vehicle related services (gas stations, car washes, car dealers or repair services) allowed.

Another significant concern with the proposed ODs is the "build-to line" provided in the East High Street Conservation District (EHSCD). The allowance for an uneven build-to line in the Capitol Avenue Conservation District (CACD) reflects the current style of development along this street. However, the East High Street CD does not reflect the type of historical development along this street. Unlike the primary downtown area,

¹ Landform Urban Planning Services, PGAV- Urban Consulting and Techniplan Inc., St. Louis, MO "Comprehensive Plan Update," March, 1996. (Report on file with City of Jefferson, Planning and Zoning Division.)

where commercial buildings were built with adjoining walls and to the front sidewalk, this section of E. High Street developed with commercial “nodes” located at the corners, the most visible locations. At these corner locations, commercial buildings often share side walls and the front entrance is at the edge of the sidewalk. In between these nodes, residential structures are often found, separated from the sidewalk by a small front yard. The current language in the E. High Street CD would require commercial storefronts replace any existing residential structure, should that building be lost to fire or other catastrophe. In many cases, the elevation is such that connection to the sidewalk would mean lowering the front façade several feet, making it lower as well as built forward of its neighboring structures. Such piecemeal redevelopment would be detrimental to the remaining mid-block structures, blocking their view of much of the street and natural light, resulting in a disruptive influence in the streetscape. The HCJ recommends adjusting the language in the E. High Street CD to require the build-to line on the areas of E. High, Lafayette, E. McCarty and Ash Streets indicated on the proposed map to only pertain to the corner lots, or where current buildings reach the sidewalk. Mid-block development would then use a build-to line as in the Capitol Avenue CD, where an uneven line averages the distance to the sidewalk, allowing residential use to remain.

In section 2(a)(4) of the proposed bill to establish the Capitol Avenue Overlay District (CACD), reference is made to: “Exterior alteration, rehabilitation, renovation and remodeling, including façade renovations, rehabilitation, or alterations.” Under current building codes, HCJ requests clarification as to what exterior changes require a building permit. For example, would removal or replacement of a front porch require a permit? Replacement of windows? Removal of window hoods or other decorative details? During a public open house, city staff stated that repair or removal of a front porch that violated code would not need to meet requirements under the CDs (also stated under 2(b)(9) of the CACD), which could encourage neglect of a historic property in order to force porch removal without replacement. If a building permit is not required for such exterior alterations, then how would city staff enforce this portion of the CDs? Or, if a property owner performed such alterations without applying for a permit, what would be the consequences?

Paragraph 2.b.(5) states: “Maintenance, repair or replacement of any exterior architectural feature of a structure which does not change the design, material or outward appearance of the structure” is exempt from the CDs. This leaves evaluation of whether such changes represent a change in appearance to the property owner and their contractor. As most contractors prefer to replace historic materials with new rather than wrestle with repair of unfamiliar components, they are not likely to be objective in evaluating the impact of this change to “outward appearances.” Sometimes, the property owner’s vision and the contractor’s vision are not the same. Review of a building permit with project details by city staff is recommended as part of an objective process.

In 2.c.(6), Landscaping, the only requirement is that not more than 5 percent of the front yard shall be covered with crushed rock or gravel. HCJ requests that landscaping be placed in front of any porches constructed, using a combination of trees, shrubs, perennials and annuals so that at least 75 percent of the plant materials used should be expected to survive from year to year.

Under 2.d.(1)(a), the statement “Exterior walls of primary structures facing a street shall be finished with brick or stone” should be clarified to exclude faux brick or stone panels made of plastic, as at least one example already exists in the area.

In section 2.d.(2)(a), Architectural Features, there are blanks for two of the proposed three or more features to be incorporated into new construction. Since the CD requires three features to be incorporated, more than three need to be suggested. Suggestions should include:

- Cornice decorations, such as swags or brackets similar to those found on Capitol Avenue.
- Window hoods, similar to those found on Capitol Avenue.
- Arched topped windows.
- Multiple pane windows.
- Transoms and / or sidelights at main entry.
- Porte-cochere (historic covered vehicular entry)
- Pilasters

Regarding roofs in 2.d.(3), modern metal roofs should not be allowed. One such roof was recently installed on Capitol Avenue, and while the color helps it blend with the house, such materials were not original to the house nor are they found within the CACD boundary. Original standing seam metal roofs, such as on the turret of the Marmaduke House, may be repaired or repainted, and modern materials incorporating fiberglass or similar fibers may be used for recoating.

In 2.d.(4), Windows and Doors, a minimum percentage of the front façade must consist of windows. HCJ requests that (1) a maximum percentage also be determined, to eliminate the possibility of glass sided modern buildings within the CACD. Off hand, a 20 percent maximum seems likely, but a more thorough analysis with city staff might be appropriate, (2) in paragraph (a), it should be clarified that for existing buildings, window and door openings shall not be made smaller than the original by more than 4” on all sides, where visible from any street, (3) that storm windows are not be utilized without or in place of sash windows and (4) solid, single pane windows are not allowed – a minimum of double hung sash shall be installed, with multiple glazed panes as appropriate to the architectural style of the building.

The paragraph 2.d.(5) addresses front porches, as far as width (or length) and depth requirements. HCJ requests that this be expanded to indicate that (1) no unpainted treated wood shall be allowed after a period of six months from installation to allow

weathering of treated surface prior to painting, or as recommended by treated wood manufacturer; (2) porch details such as entablature, column capitals, cornices, brackets and / or decorative posts also be required – perhaps a minimum number of architectural details as listed for main facades; (3) roofs of porches must match the existing building, and may not utilize corrugated material of any kind; (4) porch construction must facilitate ADA accessibility issues as much as possible, removing the need for wood or concrete ramp construction.

Comments for the East High Street Overlay District (EHSCD) by the HCJ are the same as listed above, except for the discussion of build-to-lines provided at the beginning of these comments and the following.

In section 3.c.(9)(a), Signage, the proposal language is inconsistent, as it states “Each sign shall not exceed twenty-four (24) square feet in area and ten (10) feet in height.” First, HCJ seeks clarification regarding 24 vs. 48 square feet in area. Second, assuming 48 square feet was meant, and as 48 square feet will most likely result in a sign eight feet wide by six feet tall, we request that the height be limited to eight feet. This is taller than the four foot height allowed in the CACD, and any signs currently taller than eight feet (such as Sipi’s) would be grandfathered in. Otherwise, an 8’ by 6’ sign installed at a height of 10’ would appear top heavy.

Under 3.d.(2) Architectural Features, a slide was used by city staff in presenting the proposal titled “Anatomy of a Main Street Building,” which may be included in the Downtown Design Guidelines. The list provided in the proposal is incomplete, so using this slide, HCJ suggests that the following be included, with a minimum of three being required.

- Cornice, with or without brackets.
- Window hoods.
- Storefront, including display windows with columns, bulkheads and lintel.
- Transoms.

Thank you for allowing the Historic City of Jefferson to comment on the proposed Capitol Avenue Conservation District and the East High Street Conservation District. We look forward to continued discussion as these proposals move through the review process. If there are any questions or concerns regarding HCJ’s comments, we would be glad to meet with city representatives to work toward a resolution.

Sincerely,

Tammy Boeschen

President

Historic City of Jefferson

Barron, Eric

From: Stratman, Anne
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Barron, Eric; McMillan, Janice
Subject: FW: Capitol Avenue/East High Street Comments

From: Brian Bernskoetter [<mailto:brianb@swllc.us.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 8:33 AM
To: Stratman, Anne
Subject: Capitol Avenue/East High Street Comments

Planning and Zoning Staff of the City of Jefferson,

On behalf of the Jefferson City Area Board of Realtors® we would like to submit the following comments regarding the proposed creation of an “overlay district” on the High Street and East Capitol Neighborhoods.

1. Uncertainty in real estate development can scuttle projects that otherwise have the resources and backing of the community. This problem is generally exacerbated with the restoration/redevelopment of older homes in historically significant areas such as High Street and East Capitol.
2. As a practical matter, when a redevelopment project is under taken in a historic neighborhood the intention is to restore the home to the original look and character. Anything contrary to that makes a structure undesirable thus devaluing the property and surrounding structures.
3. We agree that “guidelines” would be useful and appropriate to assist building owners in matching the appearance of a restored/redeveloped structures in historic neighborhoods.
4. We agree that in the instance of a new structure built in an overlay district that it’s reasonable to require it to meet certain design and esthetic requirements.
5. As currently contemplated, we support the re-alignment of zoning ordinances for High Street and East Capitol.

This is a laudable challenge that City Council and staff have undertaken and we commend you for the effort. If there are ways, the Jefferson City Area Board of Realtors® can be of further assistance please let us know.

With Regards,

Brian Bernskoetter
Government Affairs Director
JCABOR

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Barron, Eric

From: Stratman, Anne
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 7:51 AM
To: Barron, Eric; McMillan, Janice
Subject: FW: Capitol Avenue/East High Street Rezoning and Overlay Districts Comments

From: Toni Prawl [mailto:toni.prawl@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:19 PM
To: Stratman, Anne
Cc: ICE 1 Dennis Ceglenski
Subject: Capitol Avenue/East High Street Rezoning and Overlay Districts Comments

Department of Planning & Protective Services,

Thank you for notifying us about the city's proposed Capitol Avenue/East High Street rezoning and overlay districts. We appreciate the public meetings and online postings the city has provided and have the following comments to offer.

We object to Section 3.C.(3)(a)(i) and ask that it be changed to match what is proposed for the Capitol Avenue overlay district found in Section 3.(2)(c)(3)(a). We do not support mandatory building at the property/street line and request that requirement be removed from the East High Street proposed ordinance, especially as it pertains to our neighborhood. Our house is on the west side of the 200 block of Lafayette Street. Our property borders the alley, Commercial Way, which is the proposed dividing line between the MU-1 and MU-2 districts. Immediately north of our property, within the same 200 block of Lafayette Street, the proposed ordinance changes from MU-2 to MU-1; MU-2 resumes north of Capitol Avenue throughout the 100 block of Lafayette St. The majority of buildings on Lafayette Street within the proposed MU-1 **and** MU-2 district are set back from the property line. New buildings situated at the street line instead of set back like the existing buildings will alter the cohesive and fairly uniform building setback that is characteristic of most these blocks.

The present, relatively consistent alignment helps create a regular rhythm within the block; buildings stand "shoulder to shoulder," not out in front of one another or in competition with each other. Retaining this regular alignment would help avoid any one building from dominating the streetscape through a prominent position at the street line. It also would prevent a disturbing zigzag effect resulting from alternating setbacks (established setbacks in contrast to adjacent, new street line construction). Keeping the existing setbacks would help preserve the historic character of these blocks versus introducing new and incompatible design features where building to the street line is not consistent with the current neighborhood composition. If new buildings must be constructed at the street line, existing buildings will appear to be "recessed" on the adjacent parcels. New buildings at the street line will obscure the view **to** as well as the view **from** the existing adjacent buildings.

Besides being historically incompatible, it affects the aesthetic quality of the blocks, the amount of light that can enter the existing buildings, and also could decrease property values of the existing buildings due to the undesirable impacts created by the new construction requirements. The current building setbacks contribute to the spatial relationship of the blocks and allow for a regular alignment.

Additionally, we request that all city planning efforts recognize historic properties and their boundaries within the city when proposing any zoning or overlay concepts. The Capitol Avenue Historic District, a district listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), includes buildings besides those within the proposed MU-1 overlay district. Because the MU-1 overlay district is more conservative than the MU-2 overlay district, why not include the entire NRHP district (all its boundaries) within the MU-1 overlay district to help preserve the historic character of those buildings and the integrity of the district? Adding this NRHP district layer to the proposed overlay zoning maps would facilitate comparison of the polygons, making the location of the historic district visible in relation to the proposed MU-1 and MU-2 districts. This consideration could help protect these areas of the city that are recognized for their historical and architectural significance instead of potentially threatening them with incompatible design guidelines.

We hope to see the new property/street line construction expectation removed from the proposed MU-2 overlay district especially as it relates to our area on Lafayette Street so any new construction will be allowed to follow the average setback of the block. This affords flexibility, block by block, within the East High Overlay District. If the average, existing setback currently is the street line for some blocks, that continues to remain an option for those blocks. Thank you again for the opportunity to express our concerns and we ask that you share our comments with the Historic Preservation Commission prior to its next meeting. Also, please acknowledge receipt of this email so we know it was sent successfully.

Respectfully,

Dennis Ceglenski and Toni Prawl

210 Lafayette St.

Jefferson City, MO

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
